

Selected Excerpt from DRAFT Meeting Summary
BROADWAY BOULEVARD STAFF TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 2, 2014

1-4 p.m.

**UA Downtown Campus, 44 N. Stone, Classroom 119
Tucson, Arizona 85701**

Staff Present (alphabetical by last name):

John Beall, Planning & Development Services
Camila Bekat, Office of Economic Initiatives
Ann Chanecka, Tucson Dept. of Transportation
Carlos de Leon, Tucson Dept. of Transportation
Jim DeGrood, Regional Transportation Authority
Britton Dornquast, RTA MainStreet Business Assistance Program
Donovan Durband, ParkWise
Albert Elias, City Manager's Office
Rick Ellis, Pima County Dept. of Transportation
Leslie Ethen, Office of Integrated Planning
Damian Fellows, City Attorney's Office
Nicole Gavin, Office of Integrated Planning
Mike Holder, Regional Transportation Authority
Jonathan Mabry, Office of Integrated Planning
Hector Martinez, Office of Real Estate
Irene Ogata, Office of Integrated Planning
Rebecca Ruopp, Office of Integrated Planning
Adam Smith, Planning & Development Services
Andy Squire, Office of Economic Initiatives
Diahn Swartz, Tucson Dept. of Transportation

Broadway Project Team Present (alphabetical by last name): Joan Beckim, Phil Erickson, Myrlene Francis, Michael Johnson, Jim Schoen, Tim Smith, Phil Swaim, Jennifer Toothaker Burdick

Large Group Discussion and Recommendations

After the presentations, the group focused on what alternatives should be eliminated and why. **As technical topic matter experts**, each Committee member was asked to put up to 3 sticker dots on a poster for those alternatives they think should be eliminated at this point in the project. (Only 1 dot per alternative.) The Committee placed their dots, then the group discussed their reasons for eliminating options and notes were captured on the poster (see Table 1 on next page).

The staff Technical Advisory Committee members unanimously recommended the following:

- Eliminate all alternatives but the 6-Lane and the 4+2T (reasons listed below with each alternative).
- While the TAC does not recommend implementing a 4+2T design immediately, the project team should spend time working on:
 - A 6-lane design that can convert to 4+2T;
 - Roadway design features that will enhance existing bus services (regular bus and limited stop/express routes); and
 - Design features that can accommodate future High Capacity Transit (whether it is streetcar, Bus Rapid Transit, light rail).

Table 1. Summary of Broadway Project Technical Advisory Committee Recommendations and Comments Regarding Broadway Street Design Concept Alternatives

Alternatives/ Recommendations	Overall Properties Impacted	Direct Building Impacts	Estimated Acquisition	Estimated Construction	Total
	Total (# Historic / # Significant)				
6-Lanes (~118' Right of Way)					
Minimize Building Impacts:	143 (92/2)	37 (23/0)	\$66.4 M	\$ 26.2 M	\$92.6 M
Minimize Property Impacts:	96 (65/2)	41 (26/0)	\$44.1 M	\$ 26.2 M	\$70.3 M
Staff Recommendation: Make this alternative the priority focus of project design now. Focus on how roadway could convert to a 4+2 dedicated transit lanes, as ridership and technologies warrant.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Creates enhanced benefit to automobilesCreates enhanced benefit to transitCould accommodate future High Capacity TransitRemnant properties are reasonably sizedFundable by RTA and Pima County					
4-Lane + 2 Dedicated Transit Lanes (118' Right of Way)					
Minimize Building Impacts:	143 (90/2)	37 (23/0)	\$66.4 M	\$ 26.2 M	\$92.6 M
Minimize Property Impacts:	96 (65/2)	41 (26/0)	\$44.1 M	\$ 26.2 M	\$70.3 M
Staff Recommendation: Focus on 6-lane design that could convert to a 4+2 dedicated transit lanes, when ridership and technologies warrant.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Enhances transit, but creates congestion for automobilesCurrent and modelled transit service does not provide enough functionality to warrant reduction in auto laneCongestion worse than for the 4-lane or existingNo enhanced benefit to automobilesNot fundable by Pima County or RTA because solution creates no added functionality or benefit to auto-driving public (the majority of users on Broadway today are in cars)<ul style="list-style-type: none">Repayment of expenditures to date would be required by RTA and Pima County (~\$7 M)					

Alternatives/ Recommendations	Overall Properties Impacted	Direct Building Impacts	Estimated Acquisition	Estimated Construction	Total
	Total (# Historic / # Significant)				
4-Lane (96' Right of Way) <i>Minimize Building Impacts:</i> <i>Minimize Property Impacts:</i>	124 (84/1) 89 (54/1)	5(4/0) 28(17/0)	\$ 48.6 M \$ 35.0 M	\$ 23.3 M \$ 22.6 M	\$ 71.9 M \$ 57.6 M
Staff Recommendation: Eliminate from consideration.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Does not accommodate future High Capacity TransitNo enhanced benefit to automobilesNo enhanced benefit to transitNot fundable by Pima County or RTA because solution creates no added functionality or benefit to auto-driving public (the majority of users on Broadway today are in cars)<ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Repayment of expenditures to date would be required by RTA and Pima County (~\$7 M)</i>Too far off from the project described in the 2 measures previously voted on (1997 Pima County Transportation Bonds; 2006 RTA Plan)Limits future economic vitality because it doesn't provide enough investment and visible; it is not a catalyst for a better economic future in the areaTime and money spent on studying this further takes away from potential of other alternatives					
6-Lanes + 2 Dedicated Transit Lanes (150' Right of Way)	121 (75/5)	69 (44/0)	\$53.0 M	\$30.1 M	\$83.1 M
Staff Recommendation: Eliminate from consideration.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Benefits to automobiles and transit worse than the 6-laneDoes not serve non-transportation specific measures well (e.g., Economic Vitality, Impacts to Historic and Significant Resources, Environmental / Public Health, and others)Does not really allow for building a roadway that relates well to existing context (context sensitive)Shallow lots restrict ability to attract denser infill and businessesLow benefits to cost ratio, given that there are higher impacts and costs, but performance does not improve on a complementaryFundable by RTA and Pima County because meets the bond and ballot languageConstruction and acquisition costs alone create doubt that option is cost feasible					
Add Sidewalk to Existing Roadway (No Widening)	104 (47*/0*) <i>*full acquisitions</i>	0	\$17 -\$24 M	\$0.7 M	\$17.7- \$24.7 M
Staff Recommendation: Example of what City would face if widening not undertaken now; staff recommendation is to avoid this situation.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Complies with 2013 joint US DOJ/DOT ruling regarding installation of ADA pathways and curb ramps when roadways are altered. <i>If the City resurfaces the roadbed, it will trigger compliance. Such maintenance will be needed within the next 5-15 years. Roadway resurfacing would cost \$5-6 M more than above costs.</i>No enhanced benefit to automobilesNo enhanced benefit to transitDoes not accommodate ROW for future High Capacity TransitNot fundable by Pima County or RTA because solution creates no added functionality or benefit to auto-driving public (the majority of users on Broadway today are in cars)<ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Repayment of expenditures to date would be required by RTA and Pima County (~\$7 M)</i>					